

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed September 8, 2005. Applicants add new Claims 25-33, which are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Section 112 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph because the claims allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the Application in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the Applicants, at the time the Application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner submits that the limitation “wherein the at least one command is used for restoring at least a portion of the computer system other than a host file having the malicious code to the state that existed prior to the portion of the computer system having been modified by the malicious code” was allegedly not disclosed in the Application as originally filed.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. While the Applicants do not intend to limit the scope of the claimed subject matter to any single embodiment disclosed by the Application, Applicants note that the Application as originally filed indicates, in part, that “commands are used to restore file names, system registry settings and/or other operating system properties known to be altered or damaged by particular computer viruses.” *Specification*, p. 5. Because “system registry settings” and “other operating system properties known to be altered or damaged by particular computer viruses” may, in particular embodiments of the claimed invention, represent examples of “a portion of the computer system other than a host file having the malicious code,” the Application as originally filed did describe the relevant limitation. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 and its dependents.

Although Claims 6, 11, and 16 are of differing scope from Claim 1, the subject matter recited by Claims 6, 11, and 16 is, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed for Claim 1, also described in the Application as originally filed. Claims 6, 11, and 16 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6, 11, and 16, and their respective dependents.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner submits that the limitation “wherein the at least one command is used for restoring at least a portion of the computer system other than a host file having the malicious code to the state that existed prior to the portion of the computer system having been modified by the malicious code” allegedly was not described in the Application in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention. As indicated above, “system registry settings” and “other operating system properties known to be altered or damaged by particular computer viruses” may, in particular embodiments of the claimed invention, represent examples of “a portion of the computer system other than a host file having the malicious code.” Additionally, while Applicants do not intend to limit the scope of the claimed subject matter to any single embodiment, the Application describes at least one example for restoring such a portion of the computer system. Specifically, the Application discloses, in part:

Computer viruses may also tamper with operating system files including Windows registry and/or initialization files. The Windows registry is a database consisting of two files used to store settings and options for Windows and contains information and settings for all the hardware, software, users, and preferences of the computer. The Windows registry has a hierarchical structure with main branches containing sub-branches, called “keys”, which store “values” containing the actual information stored in the registry. Some computer viruses may tamper with the Windows registry and/or initialization files. For example, during installation, the “Happy99.Worm” virus may add to the Windows registry, a key with a corresponding value, where the value is the name of a file to be executed upon system startup, thereby activating the virus unbeknownst to the user every time the computer is started. Accordingly, in order to restore a computer system damaged by such a computer virus, the restoration command data file may also include the ability to read, write and delete values located within Windows files, such as the Windows registry, and/or initialization (INI) files, such as “System.ini”. The Windows registry manipulation commands used may include “ReadRegKey”, “WriteRegKey”, and “DelRegKey”, while the INI file manipulation command may include “ReadINIKey” and “WriteINIKey”. The command names, input parameters and functions are as follows:

ReadRegKey (variable, key, value) reads data located in a value field of a key into a variable;

WriteRegKey (key, value, variable) writes data from a variable into a value field of a key. If the key or the value does not exist, they will be created;

DeleteRegKey (key, value) deletes the value field of a specified key, or if the value parameter is left empty, the entire key;

ReadINIKey (variable, INI filename, Section, Key) reads data located in a section field of a key located within a specified INI file; and

WriteINIKey (INI filename, Section, Key, variable) writes data from a variable into a section field of a key located within a specified INI file. If the variable is set to 'NULL', then the key will be removed.

*Specification*; page 7, line 22 - page 8, line 20.

Consequently, for at least these reasons, the limitation "wherein the at least one command is used for restoring at least a portion of the computer system other than a host file having the malicious code to the state that existed prior to the portion of the computer system having been modified by the malicious code" was described in the Application in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which the Application pertains to make and/or use the claimed invention. Claim 1 is thus allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 and its dependents.

Although Claims 6, 11, and 16 are of differing scope from Claim 1, the subject matter of Claims 6, 11, and 16 is, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed for Claim 1, described in the Application in such a manner as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention. Claims 6, 11, and 16 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6, 11, and 16, and their respective dependents.

**New Claims**

Applicants add new Claims 25-33, which are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. Claims 25-26, 27-28, 29-30, and 31-32 depend from Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, respectively. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been shown above to be allowable. Additionally, Claim 33 includes elements that are not disclosed by the previously-cited references. Claims 25-33 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request consideration and full allowance of Claims 25-33.


**Conclusions**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Todd A. Cason  
Reg. No. 54,020

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6452

Date: 12/05/05

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Customer Number:

**05073**